

DEC 28 2004

**LAW OFFICES  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP**

Telephone  
(202) 434-1500

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Facsimile  
(202) 434-1501

**FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

December 28, 2004

TO : U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATTN: Examiner Vincent E. Kovalick  
Group Art Unit 2673  
Serial No. 09/760,883

FAX NO.: 703-746-6067 / 703-872-9306

TELEPHONE:

FROM: H. J. Staas

RE: COMMUNICATION TO EXAMINER

YOUR REFERENCE: FJ,FHP-H228-US

OUR DOCKET: 23.1093

NO. OF PAGES (Including this Cover Sheet) 14

**PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL**

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, and is intended only for the use of the addressee(s). Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If there are any problems with this transmission, please contact us immediately.

COMMENTS:

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,  
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
on 12-28, 2004  
By Staas & Halsey  
Date 12-28-04

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 28 2004

Docket No.: 23.1093

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the Application of:

Hiroiyuki SHIBATA et al.

Serial No. 09/760,883

Group Art Unit: 2673

Confirmation No. 4981

Filed: January 17, 2001

Examiner: Vincent E. Kovalick

For: DISPLAY APPARATUS WITH REDUCED NOISE EMISSION AND DRIVING METHOD  
FOR THE DISPLAY APPARATUS

**COMMUNICATION TO THE EXAMINER REGARDING REQUEST FILED NOVEMBER 12,  
2004, FOR WITHDRAWAL OF THE FINAL OFFICE OF JULY 28, 2004, SINCE PREMATURE  
UNDER MPEP 706.07(c) - (e) AND ISSUANCE OF A NEW, NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION  
SETTING A NEW RESPONSE PERIOD**

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Examiner Kovalick:

In accordance with our discussion on even date, enclosed is a copy of the "COMMUNICATION TO THE EXAMINER REQUESTING WITHDRAWAL OF THE FINAL OFFICE OF JULY 28, 2004, SINCE PREMATURE UNDER MPEP 706.07(C) - (E) AND ISSUANCE OF A NEW, NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION SETTING A NEW RESPONSE PERIOD", filed November 12, 2004 and of the U.S.P.T.O. post card receipt for the filing of same.

The PAIR report for the subject application, copy enclosed, acknowledges receipt on November 12, 2004 of the "Communication", designated as "Miscellaneous Incoming Letter", and the Technology Center 2600 copy bears a "received November 16, 2004" date stamp on the front page of the e-document.

Incidentally, we also forwarded a courtesy copy to you, directly, on November 15, 2004 and a copy of our facsimile cover sheet forwarding same is also enclosed.

As we also discussed, the technique of Kawakami is altogether different from that of the present invention. Particularly, Kawakami discloses a plasma display adopting a sub-field scheme type of drive, and seeks to reduce light intensity level variations which result when the input video signal field frequency is varied. In Kawakami, sustain discharge pulse numbers of

Serial No. 09/760,883

Docket No.: 23.1093

sub-fields are reduced when an input video signal field frequency becomes higher than a reference field frequency, and the sustain discharge pulse numbers of the sub-fields are increased when the input video signal field frequency becomes lower than the reference field frequency. In essence, Kawakami seeks to stabilize the input video signal field frequency at the reference field frequency, thereby to reduce light intensity level variations. (See object of invention col. 2, lines 29-38).

The present invention, unlike Kawakami, provides for reducing noise emitted by a display apparatus, such as a plasma display panel, by continuously varying the frequency of a clock signal used for driving the display panel "so as to spread out noise that the display panel emits, and thereby reduce ... peak values of the noise." (Page 2 of application at lines 26-30). Claim 1 expressly recites the use of a clock signal which "is continuously varied...."

In short, Kawakami seeks to stabilize an input video signal field frequency relevant to a reference frequency to reduce variations in light intensity levels which otherwise will occur whereas the present invention intentionally, continuously varies the frequency of a clock signal used to drive a display panel thereby to achieve the desirable result of reducing noise that a display panel otherwise emits, by spreading out the noise and reducing peak values of the noise.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, we ask that you reconsider not only the premature Final Rejection but also the irrelevance of Kawakami with respect to the invention defined by the pending claims of the present application.

There being no other objections or rejections, we submit that a Notice of Allowance should be forthcoming - - and such action is earnestly submitted.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 28, 2004

By: [Signature]  
H. J. Stas  
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,  
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
on 12-28, 2004  
By: STAAS & HALSEY  
Date: 12-28-04

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 28 2004

Please Date Stamp and retur.

COMMUNICATION TO THE EXAMINER REQUESTING WITHDRAWAL OF THE FINAL OFFICE OF JULY 28, 2004, SINCE PREMATURE UNDER MPEP 706.07(c)-(e) AND ISSUANCE OF A NEW, NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION SETTING A NEW RESPONSE PERIOD (NO FEES ENCLOSED)

APPLICANT(S): Hiroyuki SHIBATA et al.

SERIAL NO: 09/760,883

CONFIRMATION NO. 4981

TITLE: DISPLAY APPARATUS WITH REDUCED NOISE EMISSION AND DRIVING METHOD FOR THE DISPLAY APPARATUS

FILING DATE: January 17, 2001

DOCKET NO: 23.1093/HJS:rpa

DUE DATE: N/A



39

COPY

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 28 2004

Docket No.: 23.1093

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Hiroiyuki SHIBATA et al.

Serial No. 09/760,883

Group Art Unit: 2673

Confirmation No. 4981

Filed: January 17, 2001

Examiner: Vincent E. Kovalick

For: DISPLAY APPARATUS WITH REDUCED NOISE EMISSION AND DRIVING METHOD  
FOR THE DISPLAY APPARATUS

**COMMUNICATION TO THE EXAMINER REQUESTING WITHDRAWAL OF THE FINAL  
OFFICE OF JULY 28, 2004, SINCE PREMATURE UNDER MPEP 706.07(c) - (e) AND  
ISSUANCE OF A NEW, NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION SETTING A NEW RESPONSE PERIOD**

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Office Action of July 28, 2004 is Prematurely Made Final by the New Grounds of  
Rejection in Item 3 of the Action.

**A. 35 USC §112 Rejection of Item 3 asserted for the first line in the Final Office  
Action**

Item 3 of the Action rejects claims 3, 7, 11, 16, 20, 24, 29 and 48-52 under 35 USC §112,  
¶1 because the specification allegedly fails to teach the claim limitation of a clock signal  
frequency which "continuously varies within a range of plus or minus one percent of a reference  
frequency".

To the contrary of the Examiner's contention, that limitation is clearly taught in the  
specification:

At page 14, lines 29-35:

...the spread-type clock oscillator 132 outputs a clock whose frequency varies with time  
in a continuous manner within a range of, for example, plus or minus a few percent of a

COPY

Serial No. 09/760,883

Docket No.: 23.1093

reference frequency ...(in a specific example, the clock frequency varies within a range of plus or minus about one percent...).

Page 17, lines 26-36 repeats the above description and then more specifically recites at lines 33-34:

...two [frequencies] at plus/minus one percent of the reference frequency ....

(Emphasis added)

Several other locations also refer to "plus or minus a few percent" - - see e.g. page 3, line 7-8, line 22, page 4, lines 7-8 and line 24, and page 5, line 3. Furthermore, the limitation was present in the original claims 3, 7, 11, 16, 20, and 24.

The §112, ¶1 rejection is raised for the first time and thus belatedly in the Final Office Action mailed July 28, 2004, rendering the final status thereof premature.

**B. Item 13: Erroneous Contention that "Applicant's amendment necessitated that the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action**

Item 1 announces that "new prior art has been introduced in the rejection of claims ....", rendering applicants remarks of the prior response "moot." Further, Item 13 asserts, erroneously, that the applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection, in accordance with which the Action is made Final under MPEP Section 706.07(a).

The Examiner errs in this position, since the only amendments made were directed to incorporating dependent claim limitations into related independent claims with cancellation of the corresponding dependent claims. Those amendments, more particularly, commonly introduced the word - - plasma - - in the preambles of the independent claims. Specifically, independent claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 19, 23, 26, and 27 were so amended and their corresponding dependent claims 4, 8, 12, 17, 21, 25 and 30 were cancelled.

Serial No. 09/760,883

Docket No.: 23.1093

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, withdrawal of the Finality of the Action mailed July 28, 2004 is mandated since premature, pursuant to MPEP 706.07(c) through 706.07(e), and the same accordingly should be withdrawn and a new, non-final Office Action issued, setting a new Response period based on the mailing date of same.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 12, 2004 By: H. J. Staas  
H. J. Staas  
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501


COPY




# United States Patent and Trademark Office

Home | Site Index | Search | FAQ | Glossary | Guides | Contacts | eBusiness | eBiz alerts | News | Help

## PATENT APPLICATION INFORMATION RETRIEVAL



### Other Links



### Image File Wrapper for Application No.:09/760,883

NE1

This application is officially maintained in electronic form. To View: Click the desired Document Description, the desired document(s) and click Download.

Mail Room Date	Document Description	Document Category
11/12/2004	<u>Miscellaneous Incoming Letter</u>	PROSECUTION
07/28/2004	<u>Final Rejection</u>	PROSECUTION
07/13/2004	<u>Examiner Search Notes</u>	PROSECUTION
06/25/2004	<u>Examiner Search Notes</u>	PROSECUTION
05/12/2004	<u>Miscellaneous Incoming Letter</u>	PROSECUTION
05/12/2004	<u>Amendment</u>	PROSECUTION
05/12/2004	<u>Applicant Arguments or Remarks Made in an Amendment</u>	PROSECUTION
05/12/2004	<u>Claim</u>	PROSECUTION
12/12/2003	<u>Foreign Reference</u>	PROSECUTION
12/12/2003	<u>List of References cited by Applicant</u>	PROSECUTION
12/12/2003	<u>List of references cited by Examiner</u>	PROSECUTION
12/12/2003	<u>Non-Final Rejection</u>	PROSECUTION
12/04/2003	<u>Examiner Search Notes</u>	PROSECUTION
12/03/2003	<u>Examiner Search Notes</u>	PROSECUTION
09/23/2003	<u>Drawings</u>	PROSECUTION
09/23/2003	<u>Amendment</u>	PROSECUTION
09/23/2003	<u>Applicant Arguments or Remarks Made in an Amendment</u>	PROSECUTION
09/23/2003	<u>Claim</u>	PROSECUTION
09/23/2003	<u>Request for Continued Examination (RCE)</u>	PROSECUTION
05/23/2003	<u>List of references cited by Examiner</u>	PROSECUTION
05/23/2003	<u>Final Rejection</u>	PROSECUTION
04/22/2003	<u>Information Disclosure Statement</u>	PROSECUTION
04/22/2003	<u>NPL Documents</u>	PROSECUTION
	<u>Applicant Arguments or Remarks Made in</u>	



03/11/2003	an Amendment	PROSECUTION
03/11/2003	Claim	PROSECUTION
03/11/2003	Amendment	PROSECUTION
03/11/2003	Miscellaneous Incoming Letter	PROSECUTION
03/11/2003	Drawings	PROSECUTION
11/04/2002	Non-Final Rejection	PROSECUTION
10/21/2002	Examiner Search Notes	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Drawings	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Transmittal of New Application	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Claims recorded on File Wrapper	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Search info on File Wrapper	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Issue Information on File Wrapper	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Foreign Priority Papers Filed	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Claims Worksheet (PTO-2022)	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Fee Worksheet (PTO-875)	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Fee Worksheet (PTO-875)	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Bibliographic Data Sheet	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Oath or Declaration filed	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Abstract	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Claim	PROSECUTION
01/17/2001	Specification	PROSECUTION
04/22/2003	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART
04/22/2003	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART
04/22/2003	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART
04/22/2003	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART
04/22/2003	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART
04/22/2003	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART
01/17/2001	Transmittal of New Application	AS FILED
01/17/2001	Specification	AS FILED
01/17/2001	Claim	AS FILED
01/17/2001	Abstract	AS FILED
01/17/2001	Drawings	AS FILED
01/17/2001	Oath or Declaration filed	AS FILED

Sorted By : Document Category

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 28 2004

2673  
41

Docket No.: 23.1093



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

NOV 16 2004

Re the Application of:

Hiroyuki SHIBATA et al.

Serial No. 09/760,883

Group Art Unit: 2673

Technology Center 2600

Confirmation No. 4981

Filed: January 17, 2001

Examiner: Vincent E. Kovalick

For: DISPLAY APPARATUS WITH REDUCED NOISE EMISSION AND DRIVING METHOD  
FOR THE DISPLAY APPARATUS

**COMMUNICATION TO THE EXAMINER REQUESTING WITHDRAWAL OF THE FINAL  
OFFICE OF JULY 28, 2004, SINCE PREMATURE UNDER MPEP 706.07(c) - (e) AND  
ISSUANCE OF A NEW, NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION SETTING A NEW RESPONSE PERIOD**

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Office Action of July 28, 2004 is Prematurely Made Final by the New Grounds of  
Rejection in Item 3 of the Action.

**A. 35 USC §112 Rejection of Item 3 asserted for the first time in the Final Office  
Action**

Item 3 of the Action rejects claims 3, 7, 11, 16, 20, 24, 29 and 48-52 under 35 USC §112,  
¶1 because the specification allegedly fails to teach the claim limitation of a clock signal  
frequency which "continuously varies within a range of plus or minus one percent of a reference  
frequency".

To the contrary of the Examiner's contention, that limitation is clearly taught in the  
specification:

At page 14, lines 29-35:

...the spread-type clock oscillator 132 outputs a clock whose frequency varies with time  
in a continuous manner within a range of, for example, plus or minus a few percent of a

**LAW OFFICES  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP**

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**DEC 28 2004**

Telephone  
(202) 434-1500

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Facsimile  
(202) 434-1501

**FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

November 15, 2004

**TO : U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**ATTN: Examiner Vincent E. Kovalick  
Group Art Unit 2673**

**FAX NO.: 703-746-6067**

**TELEPHONE:**

**FROM: H. J. Staas**

**RE: COMMUNICATION TO EXAMINER (COURESTY COPY)**

**YOUR REFERENCE: FJ,FHP-H228-US**

**OUR DOCKET: 23.1093**

**NO. OF PAGES (Including this Cover Sheet) 4**

**PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL**

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, and is intended only for the use of the addressee(s). Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If there are any problems with this transmission, please contact us immediately.

**COMMENTS:**

**COPY**

DEC 28 2004

Docket No.: 23.1093

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Hiroiyuki SHIBATA et al.

Serial No. 09/760,883

Group Art Unit. 2673

Confirmation No. 4981

Filed: January 17, 2001

Examiner: Vincent E. Kovalick

For: DISPLAY APPARATUS WITH REDUCED NOISE EMISSION AND DRIVING METHOD  
FOR THE DISPLAY APPARATUS

**COMMUNICATION TO THE EXAMINER REQUESTING WITHDRAWAL OF THE FINAL  
OFFICE OF JULY 28, 2004, SINCE PREMATURE UNDER MPEP 706.07(c) - (e) AND  
ISSUANCE OF A NEW, NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION SETTING A NEW RESPONSE PERIOD**

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Office Action of July 28, 2004 is Prematurely Made Final by the New Grounds of  
Rejection in Item 3 of the Action.

**A. 35 USC §112 Rejection of Item 3 asserted for the first line in the Final Office  
Action**

Item 3 of the Action rejects claims 3, 7, 11, 16, 20, 24, 29 and 48-52 under 35 USC §112,  
¶1 because the specification allegedly fails to teach the claim limitation of a clock signal  
frequency which "continuously varies within a range of plus or minus one percent of a reference  
frequency".

To the contrary of the Examiner's contention, that limitation is clearly taught in the  
specification:

At page 14, lines 29-35:

...the spread-type clock oscillator 132 outputs a clock whose frequency varies with time  
in a continuous manner within a range of, for example, plus or minus a few percent of a

COPY

Serial No. 09/760,883

Docket No.: 23.1093

reference frequency ...(in a specific example, the clock frequency varies within a range of plus or minus about one percent...).

Page 17, lines 26-36 repeats the above description and then more specifically recites at lines 33-34:

...two [frequencies] at plus/minus one percent of the reference frequency ....

(Emphasis added)

Several other locations also refer to "plus or minus a few percent" -- see e.g. page 3, line 7-8, line 22, page 4, lines 7-8 and line 24, and page 5, line 3. Furthermore, the limitation was present in the original claims 3, 7, 11, 16, 20, and 24.

The §112, ¶1 rejection is raised for the first time and thus belatedly in the Final Office Action mailed July 28, 2004, rendering the final status thereof premature.

**B. Item 13: Erroneous Contention that "Applicant's amendment necessitated that the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action**

Item 1 announces that "new prior art has been introduced in the rejection of claims ....", rendering applicants remarks of the prior response "moot." Further, Item 13 asserts, erroneously, that the applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection, in accordance with which the Action is made Final under MPEP Section 706.07(a).

The Examiner errs in this position, since the only amendments made were directed to incorporating dependent claim limitations into related independent claims with cancellation of the corresponding dependent claims. Those amendments, more particularly, commonly introduced the word -- plasma -- in the preambles of the independent claims. Specifically, independent claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 19, 23, 26; and 27 were so amended and their corresponding dependent claims 4, 8, 12, 17, 21, 25 and 30 were cancelled.

COPY

Serial No. 09/760,883

Docket No.: 23.1093

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, withdrawal of the Finality of the Action mailed July 28, 2004 is mandated since premature, pursuant to MPEP 706.07(c) through 706.07(e), and the same accordingly should be withdrawn and a new, non-final Office Action issued, setting a new Response period based on the mailing date of same.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 12, 2004 By: H. J. Staas  
H. J. Staas  
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

COPY